

10580509

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)See Form PCT/ISA/210
(sheet 2)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

307267

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/052753

International filing date (day/month/year)

02.11.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

09.12.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

F02M3/02, H01F27/32

Applicant

ROBERT BOSCH GMBH

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability: citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/052753

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/052753

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1, 2	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	3-6	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-6	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
1. This opinion makes reference to the following documents:			
D1: US 2002/158740 A1 (PAUL MARK ALBERT <i>ET AL</i>) 31 October 2002 (2002-10-31)			
D2: WO 97/22981 A1 (HITACHI, LTD; HITACHI CAR ENGINEERING CO., LTD; KONDO, EIICHIRO; SUGIU) 26 June 1997 (1997-06-26)			
<u>Claim 1</u>			
2. The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claim 1 is not novel under PCT Article 33(2).			
3. D1 discloses an ignition coil for an ignition system of an internal combustion engine (D1, paragraph 0003), having a housing (D1, paragraph 0026, line 6: "case 34"), having a magnetically active core (D1, paragraph 0026, lines 1-2), having a first coil winding which is connected to a supply voltage and having a second coil winding which is connected to a high-voltage connection (paragraph 0026, lines 3-4), wherein at least one			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/052753

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

electrically conducting component is provided, at least in regions, with a means for electrically active levelling of its surface (paragraph 0028).

Claims 2-6

4. With regard to D1, dependent claim 2 does not appear to contain any features which meet the PCT requirements for inventive step.

5. With regard to D1 and D2, dependent claims 3-6 do not appear to contain any features which meet the PCT requirements for inventive step.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/052753

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

6. Claim 1 does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 because the subject matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. The claim attempts to define the subject matter in terms of the result to be achieved (electrically active levelling of its surface), but in so doing merely states the problem to be solved, without specifying the technical features necessary for achieving this result.